

REMARKS

Examiner Kovalick is thanked for the thorough examination of the subject Patent Application. The Claims have been carefully reviewed and amended, and are considered to be in condition for allowance.

5 Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) of Claims 1 and 7 as being unpatentable over in U. S. Patent Application 2005/0024382 (Ho, et al.) in view of U. S. Patent 2002/0158885 (Brokenshire, et al.) taken with or further in view of U. S. Patent 5,818,935 (Maa) is requested in light of the following arguments.

10 Ho, et al. does provide a color conversion apparatus for converting a first color in a first color space to a second color in a second color space. The color conversion apparatus includes lookup tables storing color mappings relating the first color space to the second color space and a converter using the lookup tables to convert the first color to the second color. Brokenshire, et al. does
15 provide an apparatus for generating anti-aliased lines for display in a data processing system. Graphics data is received for display, wherein the graphics data includes primitives defining lines. A gamma correction is applied to the graphics data on a per primitive basis to form the anti-aliased lines. Maa does
20 provide a system for accessing the Internet based on an Internet information pointer encoded in a video signal. The system includes an Internet access device including a decoder adapted to extract the Internet information pointer

encoded in the video signal. Neither Ho, et al., nor Brokenshire, et al., nor Maa, nor Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa provides

an original gamma correction mapping table containing entries
5 describing a default luminance value to be provided to said display for a magnitude of a video input signal, said video input signal providing a default pointer to said default luminance values indicative of said magnitude; (Claim 1, Lines 3-7)

a transformed gamma correction mapping table containing entries
10 describing transformed luminance values to be provided to said display for said magnitude of said video input signal, said video input signal providing a transformed pointer to said transformed luminance values indicative of said magnitude, (Claim 1, Lines 8-12)

15 a gamma correction transform circuit that receives a new contrast signal and a new brightness signal, tests if the new contrast signal and the new brightness signal are respectively equivalent to a default contrast signal and a default brightness signal wherein:

20 if the new contrast signal is equivalent to the default contrast signal and the brightness signal is

equivalent to the default brightness signal, said a
gamma correction transform circuit is in
communication with said default gamma correction
mapping table to designate the default gamma
correction mapping table for determining said
luminance values for said display,

if the new contrast signal is not equivalent to the
default contrast signal and/or the brightness signal
is not equivalent to the default brightness signal,
said gamma correction transform circuit
transforms entries of said default gamma
correction mapping table as a function of the
contrast signal and the brightness signal, wherein
said gamma correction transform circuit is in
communication with said transformed gamma
correction mapping table to store said entries to
said transformed gamma correction mapping
table. (Claim 1, Lines 13-33)

As the Examiner has noted for the allowance statement of claims 9, 12,
13, and 18, neither Ho, et al., nor Brokenshire, et al., nor Maa, nor Ho, et al. in
view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa teaches to a
luminance value to a display includes an original gamma correction mapping

table, a transformed gamma correction mapping table, and a gamma correction transform circuit. The original gamma correction mapping table contains entries describing a default luminance value to be provided to the display for a magnitude of a video input signal. The video input signal provides a default
5 pointer to the default luminance values indicative of the magnitude. The transformed gamma correction mapping table contains entries describing transformed luminance values to be provided to the display for the magnitude of the video input signal. The video input signal provides a transformed pointer to the transformed luminance values indicative of the magnitude.

10 The gamma correction transform circuit receives a new contrast signal and a new brightness signal and tests if the new contrast signal and the new brightness signal are respectively equivalent to a default contrast signal and a default brightness signal. If the new contrast signal is equivalent to the default contrast signal and the brightness signal is equivalent to the default brightness
15 signal, the a gamma correction transform circuit is in communication with the default gamma correction mapping table to designate the default gamma correction mapping table for determining the luminance values for the display. Alternately, if the new contrast signal is not equivalent to the default contrast signal and/or the brightness signal is not equivalent to the default brightness
20 signal, the gamma correction transform circuit transforms entries of the default gamma correction mapping table as a function of the contrast signal and the brightness signal. The gamma correction transform circuit is in communication

with the transformed gamma correction mapping table to store the entries to the transformed gamma correction mapping table.

The invention as claimed in amended Claim 1 and Claim 7 is believed to be novel and patentable over Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that claimed elements of either Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. That is to say, there must be something in the prior art or line of reasoning to suggest that the combination of these various references is desirable. The applicant believes that there is no such basis for the combination. The applicant, therefore, request Examiner Kovalick reconsider the rejection in view of these arguments.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) of Claim 4 as being unpatentable over in U. S. Patent Application 2005/0024382 (Ho, et al.) in view of U. S. Patent 2002/0158885 (Brokenshire, et al.) or taken with U. S. Patent 5,818,935 (Maa) and further in view of U. S. Patent 6,246,070 (Yamazaki, et al.) is requested in light of the following arguments.

Please refer to the above arguments with respect to Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa. With regards to Yamazaki, et al., Yamazaki, et al. does

provide a thin film transistor for and LCD with enhance characteristics. The characteristics are improved by enhancing an interface between an active layer such as a channel region and an insulating film. Neither Ho, et al., nor Brokenshire, et al., nor Maa, nor Yamazaki et al., nor Ho, et al. in view of
5 Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa and further in view of Yamazaki et al., as the Examiner has noted for the allowance statement of claims 9, 12, 13, and 18, teaches to a luminance value to a display includes an original gamma correction mapping table, a transformed gamma correction mapping table, and a gamma correction transform circuit. Further, Neither Ho, et
10 al., nor Brokenshire, et al., nor Maa, nor Yamazaki et al., nor Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa and further in view of Yamazaki et al. does not provide:

4. The display controller of claim 1 wherein the gamma correction transform circuit is a microcontroller. (Claim 4, Lines 1-2)

15 Yamazaki et al. does not provide any reference to performing gamma correction transformation in a microcontroller.

The invention as claimed in Claim 4 is believed to be novel and patentable over Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa because there is not sufficient basis for
20 concluding that claimed elements of either Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of

Maa would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. That is to say, there must be something in the prior art or line of reasoning to suggest that the combination of these various references is desirable. The applicant believes that there is no such basis for the combination. The applicant, therefore, request Examiner
5 Kovalick reconsider the rejection in view of these arguments.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 USC §103(a) of Claim 8 as being unpatentable over in U. S. Patent Application 2005/0024382 (Ho, et al.) in view of U. S. Patent 2002/0158885 (Brokenshire, et al.) or taken with U. S. Patent 5,818,935 (Maa) further in view of U. S. Patent Application 2001/0015774
10 (Endo, et al.) is requested in light of the following arguments.

Please refer to the above arguments with respect to Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Maa, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa. With regards to Endo, et al., Endo, et al. does provide memory for lookup tables for storing luminance data and color difference data.

15 Neither Ho, et al., nor Brokenshire, et al., nor Maa, nor Endo et al., nor Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. taken with or further in view of Maa and further in view Endo et al., as the Examiner has noted for the allowance statement of claims 9, 12, 13, and 18, teaches to a luminance value to a display includes an original gamma correction mapping table, a transformed gamma correction
20 mapping table, and a gamma correction transform circuit.

The invention as claimed in Claim 8 is believed to be novel and patentable over Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or Endo, et al., or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. or taken with Endo because there is not sufficient basis for concluding that claimed elements of either Ho, et al., or Brokenshire, et al., or
5 Endo, or Ho, et al. in view of Brokenshire, et al. or taken with Endo, et al. would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. That is to say, there must be something in the prior art or line of reasoning to suggest that the combination of these various references is desirable. The applicant believes that there is no such basis for the combination. The applicant, therefore, request Examiner
10 Kovalick reconsider the rejection in view of these arguments.

Reconsideration of the objection to Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 as being dependent upon rejected claims is requested. The Applicant acknowledges that Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are allowable if placed in independent form. The Applicant believes that independent Claim 1 is now allowable and the rejection should be
15 reconsidered.

The related art references made of record and not relied upon have been reviewed and it is agreed that they do not suggest the present detailed claimed invention.

The Applicant acknowledges that claims 9-21 are allowed and Claims 2, 3,
20 5, and 6 are allowable if placed in independent form. The Applicant believes that Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are now allowable in light of the above arguments and

respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance for all claims be issued in this case.

It is requested that should Examiner Kovalick not find that the Claims are now allowable, that the undersigned be called at (845) 452-5863 to overcome
5 any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,
George O. Saile & Associates



Billy J. Knowles, Reg. No. 42,752

10